EXHIBIT A

May 3, 2023

```
1
                        SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
                           COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 3
           BEFORE THE HONORABLE VICTOR M. HWANG, JUDGE PRESIDING
                            DEPARTMENT NUMBER 10
 4
 5
                                  ---000---
     PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 6
 7
                     Plaintiff,
                                             Court No. CRI-23006396
 8
     vs.
     INDIA WATKINS,
                                             Pages 1 - 8
 9
10
                     Defendant.
11
12
                   REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13
                           WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2023
14
15
16
                                       CERTIFIED
                                      TRANSCRIPT
17
18
19
20
     TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED PURSUANT TO Government Code 69954(d): Any
     court, party, or person who has purchased a transcript may,
21
2.2
     without paying a further fee to the reporter, reproduce a copy
     or portion thereof as an exhibit pursuant to court order or
23
24
     rule, or for internal use, but shall not otherwise provide or
25
     sell a copy or copies to any other party or person.
26
2.7
28
     REPORTED BY: CHRISTINE L. JORDAN, CSR NO. 12262, CCRR, RPR
```

May 3, 2023

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	For the People:
3	SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE Chesa Boudin, District Attorney 350 Rhode Island Street North Building, Suite 400N San Francisco, California 94103 BY: DENNIS CHOW, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
4	
5	
6	
7	For the Defendant:
8	SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE Manohar Raju, Public Defender 555 Seventh Street San Francisco, California 94103
9	
10	BY: NADIA IQBAL, DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

May 3, 2023

```
1
               WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2023; AFTERNOON SESSION
2
                           PROCEEDINGS
3
                                 ---000---
4
              (Case called at 2:00 P.M.)
5
         THE COURT: Calling line 1, is the matter of India Watkins.
         I'll appoint the public defender's office to represent you.
6
7
        Appearances.
8
        MR. CHOW: Dennis Chow for the People.
9
        MS. IOBAL:
                    Thank you, Your Honor. Nadia Iqbal, deputy
10
    public defender specially appearing for Ms. Tamani Taylor. I am
11
     with Ms. Watkins, who is present in custody.
         We are in receipt of the complaint. Waive formal reading
12
13
     and advisement. Stipulate to due and proper arraignment.
14
    Reserve our right to demur. Enter pleas of not quilty. Deny
15
     any allegations.
         I would like to address Ms. Watkins's custodial status.
16
17
        THE COURT:
                    Sure.
18
                    Thank you.
        MS. IQBAL:
19
        Based on my review of the case, it appears she was
20
     cooperative with police and there was no incident with regard to
     her arrest. She also advised that she has been checking in with
21
22
     ACM, and she intends to ask them for assistance with housing.
     She's currently staying at a shelter, but she has advised that
23
24
     she would be able to return for all of her future court dates.
25
     She is in good status currently on her other matters.
26
                    The Court previously, on the last time she was
         THE COURT:
27
     arrested, referred her for in-custody review, and that hasn't
     seemed to have been sufficient. What are you proposing beyond
28
```

May 3, 2023

```
1
     that?
                     Perhaps we can do another referral and/or
2
         MS. IOBAL:
 3
     release her on the same terms as the previous referral along
 4
     with maybe an ankle monitor for a brief period of time to
5
     satisfy the Court. But I don't believe that --
                     I would do home detention in this case. Ankle
6
         THE COURT:
7
     monitoring wouldn't accomplish anything because I'm not trying
8
     to have her stay away from any area.
9
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
10
         MS. IOBAL: Your Honor, we would of course request that home
11
     detention not be imposed. But if that is the term the Court
12
     would be willing to release on, then we will just object and
13
     submit.
14
         THE COURT: Does she have an address where she can be
15
     released to?
16
         MS. IQBAL:
                     She does have an address, yes.
17
         THE COURT:
                     And there's somebody that can allow the sheriffs
18
     to enter to search and examine?
19
              (Pause in the proceedings.)
2.0
                     She has advised that, yes, that is the case.
         MS. IQBAL:
21
                     Okay. People want to be heard?
         THE COURT:
22
         MR. CHOW:
                    Submitted.
23
         THE COURT: All right. I'll release Ms. Watkins on a
24
     coordinated release for home detention.
25
         I have to advise you that, when you're placed on home
26
     detention, you're giving up your Fourth Amendment rights.
                                                                 The
2.7
     Court is imposing a 1035 search condition, which means your
     person, residence, vehicle, and any area under your control is
28
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

2.7

28

May 3, 2023

Page 5

subject to a search at any time, day or night, by any peace officer without reasonable suspicion or probable cause.

I'm going to release you on ACM to home detention in light of the fact that you were on ACM on the other case and receiving services. You are to attend any counseling and groups as

your residence.

MS. IQBAL: I understand she'll be on home detention. Would the Court be willing to strike the 1035 condition since she wasn't found in possession of any contraband that was on her person or anything like that?

advised by pretrial services; otherwise, remain confined within

THE COURT: To be clear: It's a new sheriff's policy. It's not the Court that's imposing the 1035. I'm advising her that under the sheriff's program, if she accepts home detention, they're requiring the 1035 on every case on GPS, SCRAM, or home detention. It's on the form itself that advises her that she's going to be subject to a 1035. Those are the conditions of the sheriff's home detention program now.

MS. IQBAL: I understand, Your Honor. But I don't think that the sheriff is -- I think it's a constitutional violation for the sheriff to impose such conditions that are not warranted or necessary to the case that the Court is not imposing as its own term related to the case.

I believe there was some ACLU litigation on the issue recently; so I would again ask the Court to strike the court-ordered provision of the 1035.

THE COURT: It's precisely because, I think, of the ACLU litigation I'm advising her now. The litigation involves her

```
not -- litigants not understanding that they're being put on
1
           But those are the conditions of the sheriff's program.
2
 3
     It's the only way, such as the 50-mile limit, that the sheriffs
4
     will accept anybody into their program, is if they're going to
5
     be under 1035; otherwise, they're not offering it.
6
         So --
7
                     I will --
        MS. IOBAL:
         THE COURT: -- beginning, I believe, next week -- I'm
8
9
     telling you for general purposes -- every defendant is going to
     be signing a 1035 waiver as they accept home detention.
10
11
     don't sign, then the sheriff will not accept them into home
12
     detention. But at this point, I've been asked to just orally
     advise folks that what's written on the form is that they are
13
14
     going to be subject to the search condition --
15
        MS. IQBAL:
                     Okav.
16
                     -- which is, I think, what the litigation is
17
     about, is that they're not noticed of the 1035.
18
        MS. IQBAL: Yeah, I think it's that in addition to that it
19
     shouldn't be a blanket term that's imposed on folks where the
20
     case or -- you know, it should be the least restrictive
21
     conditions related to the case and that person's individualized
22
     history as opposed to being a contingency upon which they're
     granted home detention or electronic monitoring.
23
24
         I understand what the Court is saying, though. It sounds
25
     like the Court will impose it in any case at this juncture; so I
26
     will object --
2.7
         THE COURT:
                     Okay.
28
                     -- for the record and submit.
        MS. IQBAL:
```

May 3, 2023

```
1
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
         How would she like to proceed in terms of time?
2
 3
         MS. IQBAL: Your Honor, we'd like to set within the ten
 4
     days, please.
5
         THE COURT: Okav.
                            I'll set a 10th day of May 17th; a 60th
6
     day of July 3rd. I'll set the matter for preliminary hearing on
7
     May 16th at 9:00 o'clock in Department 12 and order Ms. Watkins
8
    present.
9
         MR. CHOW: One-hour time estimate.
10
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you.
11
                     Thank you.
         MS. IQBAL:
         Your Honor, would the Court be able to have her other
12
13
     matters trail on May 16th as well, just in case? Sometimes
     there's --
14
15
         THE COURT:
                     I don't have those on today.
16
         MS. IQBAL:
                     Okay. So --
17
         THE COURT:
                     It looks like she has a future date of June 2nd.
18
         MS. IQBAL:
                     Okay. I'll talk to the assigned attorney to get
19
     them added. Thank you.
2.0
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you.
21
              (At 2:07 P.M., the proceedings adjourned.)
22
                                 ---000---
23
24
25
26
2.7
28
```

PEOPLE vs WATKINS CRI-23006396 May 3, 2023 Page 8 1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2 SS 3 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 4 5 I, Christine L. Jordan, Official Reporter for the Superior 6 Court of California, County of San Francisco, do hereby certify: 7 That I was present at the time of the above proceedings; 8 That I took down in machine shorthand notes all proceedings 9 had and testimony given; That I thereafter transcribed said shorthand notes with the 10 11 aid of a computer; 12 That the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct transcript of said shorthand notes and a full, true, and correct 13 14 transcript of all proceedings had and testimony taken; 15 That I am not a party to the action or related to a party or 16 counsel; That I have no financial or other interest in the outcome of 17 18 the action. 19 20 Dated: May 8, 2023 21 22 23 24 25

CHRISTINE L. JORDAN, CSR NO. 12262, CCRR, RPR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

2.7

26

28